

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application and for indicating that claim 2 contains allowable subject matter.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-5 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1. By way of this reply, claims 1-5 have been amended, and a new claim 7 has been added.

**Claim Amendments**

Claims 1-5 have been amended to clarify the present invention recited and to correct minor informalities. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments as support for these amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0037], [0038], and [0039] of the Publication of the present application, and in Figs. 2, 3, 5, and 10-12. A new claim 7 has been added to recite a limitation disclosed in, for example, paragraphs [0042] and [0052].

**Drawings**

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicates whether the formal drawings filed on January 30, 2004 are accepted.

**Objection(s)**

Claim 2 is objected to for informalities. Claim 2 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claim 2 is objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim. As discussed below, Applicant believes that the base claim 1 is allowable. Thus, rewriting claim 2 in independent form is respectfully deferred at this time.

**Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103**

Claims 1 and 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,945,672 (“Du”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,562,519 (“Deves”). Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify the present invention recited. To the extent that the rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to a vehicular headlamp including a plurality of light source units. As shown in Figs. 2-4, a light source unit 100 includes a semiconductor light emitting device 104 disposed to face upward on a substrate 106, a reflector 102 configured in a curved shape surrounding the semiconductor light emitting device 104, and a light transmitting member 108 configured to cover the semiconductor light emitting device 104. The light source unit 100 may include a lens 110 disposed on the front side.

The light transmitting member 108 covers the semiconductor light emitting device 104 and comprises a rear sealing part 202 and a front sealing part 204. The rear sealing part 202 is configured to transmit light emitted by the semiconductor light emitting device 104, whereas the front sealing part 204 is configured to deflect light emitted by the semiconductor light emitting device 104 in the forward direction (*see e.g.*, FIG. 3). The different light transmission/deflection properties of the two parts may be accomplished in several ways, several examples of which are illustrated in Figs. 2-4 and 6-9.

Amended independent claim 1 includes a limitation: “a light transmitting member configured to cover said semiconductor light emitting device, wherein *said light transmitting member comprises a front sealing part and a rear sealing part*, wherein the front sealing part deflects a portion of light generated by said semiconductor light emitting device toward the front side and the rear sealing part transmits a portion of said light generated by said semiconductor light emitting device toward said reflector.”

Du, in contrast, fails to show or suggest at least the above-mentioned limitations. Du does not teach or suggest a light transmitting member having two parts with different light transmission/deflection properties. The light beam 40, as shown in Fig. 1 of Du, is *directly* emitted by the light emitting device toward the front side, *without* being *deflected* by any members. Assuming the un-numbered element in FIG. 8 of Du is a light transmitting element, there is still no teaching that the light transmitting element comprises two parts having different transmission/deflection properties.

Deves discloses an automobile headlamp capable of emitting a beam of light with a cut-off. Deves fails to teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 because Deves is completely silent with respect to a light transmitting member having two parts with different light transmission/deflection properties. Thus, Deves does not provide that which is missing in Du.



Du and Deves, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 1. Therefore, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Du and Deves. Dependent claims 3-5 and 7 are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 02008.142001).

Dated: April 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
for  Thomas K. Scherer T. Chyau Liang  
Registration No.: 45,079 #48,885  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant